

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS COMMITTEE

March 17, 1999  
MAG Office Building, Ocotillo Room  
302 North First Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Steve Hogan, Scottsdale, Chairman  
Jim Book, Glendale  
Brian Latte, Chandler  
Gary Thomas, Gilbert  
Pierre Pretorius, Maricopa County  
Alan Sanderson, Mesa  
Mike Frisbie, Phoenix  
Randall Overmeyer for Scott Miller, RPTA

\*Ellis Perl, Surprise  
Ed VanDerGinst, Tempe  
\*Tim Wolfe, ADOT  
Alan Hansen, FHWA  
\*David Cowley, AAA Arizona  
\*Richard Traill, Phoenix Aviation

\* Not present or represented by proxy

OTHERS PRESENT

Don Dey, SAIC  
Paul Ward, MAG  
Sarath Joshua, MAG

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m. by Chairman Steve Hogan.

2. Approval of the February 19, 1999 Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the February 19, 1999 meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Call to Audience

Chairman Hogan made a call to the audience providing an opportunity to members of the public to address the ITS Committee. None in the audience spoke.

#### 4. ITS Project Selection Process for TIP

Sarath Joshua provided an overview of the ITS project rating system that was used during the recent TIP process. The system generated scores by dividing all ITS project into three categories of projects. In each category projects were scored based on five factors, producing a maximum of 100 points. For areawide projects, the rating system required ITS priority areas to be defined by each jurisdictions according to guidelines developed by the committee. However, only Phoenix, Tempe, Mesa, Chandler and Gilbert provided these maps to MAG in time. Since the priority areas could not be applied to the scoring system default values had to be used.

During the ensuing discussion the following points were made:

Steve Hogan stated that better definition was needed to identify the impact area for projects. Cost benefit scores were based on VMT/\$ project cost for both route specific and areawide projects. Brian Latte stated that this was not quite a cost/benefit but a cost factor. Sarath Joshua indicated that a new tool named IDAS will be available later this year for estimating Cost/Benefit values more accurately. One of the topics that was discussed at length was the factor, Jurisdiction Match. Chairman Hogan thought that it is a great idea but unfortunately there was some opposition in TRC for this concept for a variety of reasons and TRC has abandoned this. He stated that the concept was dropped and may not come back anytime soon. The primary champion of this concept was Mesa but even they seem to have dropped the idea. He raised the question if the committee wanted to retain this factor. Mike Frisbee stated that he was inclined against retaining this factor as it seemed to penalize larger jurisdictions. However, the general consensus among committee members was that this factor should be retained in the rating system for the present. Randy Overmeyer pointed out that this factor may create a disadvantage for smaller jurisdictions. Sarath Joshua indicated that the Strategic Plan will certainly address smaller jurisdictions and help identify their needs that can be addressed by ITS.

The committee briefly discussed the possibility of combining all three project categories in the rating system. Alan Sanderson pointed out that the subcommittee saw no simple way to combine them. Chairman Hogan stated that the subcommittee should investigate the possibility of combining areawide and route specific components of the system. That still left the task of combining transit and non-transit projects. Brian Latte stated that committee may have to decide how to split between road related and transit ITS projects. Paul Ward stated that funding allocations by mode may follow next year too.

The committee decided to request that the ITS Rating System Subcommittee refine the rating system.

Referring to information on Attachment 1, Sarath Joshua indicated that future ITS project definitions ought to be tied to ITS market package definitions in the national architecture. He stated that Paul Ward is developing new forms for TIP project submission that will address information needs on projects. Committee agreed to use Architecture definitions in the ITS architecture CD-ROM

Alan Sanderson questioned the programming process and the confusion caused by the misunderstanding regarding the Mesa project. Steve Hogan indicated that there were some misunderstandings and confusion during the recent TIP process and in the future project priorities that impact programming everything should go through this committee. Paul Ward explained that midway through the programming process a decision was made by MAG staff to program only 3 years rather the full 5 years. Programming still followed priorities established by each of the modal committees. What happened in ITS was by an error or misinterpretation. Steve Hogan stated that the problem was caused by a misunderstanding and in the future we need to be more careful

Jim Book stated that programming the 4<sup>th</sup> year was important because it takes 3 years to develop some projects. Steve Hogan asked if this shorter program was a one time event or if it is likely to occur in the future. Paul Ward responded that the next TIP will program years 2003, 2004, and 2005.

5. Update on AZTech & AZTech Phase 2

Pierre Pretorius provided an update on the AZTech project. He indicated that AZTech workstation training will be provided to jurisdictions in April. In AZTech Phase 2, all four 4 contractor, Cue, TranSmart, PBS&J and SmartRoute Systems are under contract and products would be available by by this summer. In-vehicle devices and pagers and expected to lead the list of products to enter the Phoenix market. The organizational study on the future of AZTech is underway. The first meeting was held and the next one is on April 6<sup>th</sup> 2-4 PM. National architecture mapping of AZTech will be completed by end of June. Member agencies will be contacted by PBS&J on this project. AZTech Showcasing events begin on April 26<sup>th</sup>. Approximately 30 people are expected, most local some national and from overseas. The AZTech Data Server or ADUS project is underway. The project is carried out in three stages. ADUS user requirements definition is underway. Sarath Joshua us heading a AZTech ADUS subcommittee that is leading that effort. ADUS System requirements specifications and ADUS procurement of the system will follow. Sarath Joshua provided a brief description of the function of the ADUS data server. Pierre Pretorius stated that 20 units of Palm VII will be received for rotation among AZTech members for evaluation.

6. Ramp Metering and HOV Bypass

Sarath Joshua informed the committee that this topic was directed to the ITS Committee as it dealt with ITS operations. The issue being that the current MAG policy regarding HOV bypass at metered ramps seems to be at odds with actual practice. He also stated that Tim Wolfe had informed him that Dan Lance was supposed to attend the meeting to discuss this topic but was unable to make it. Ed VanDerGinst suggested that this item be moved to a future meeting, since there was no one present to represent ADOT's views on this topic. The committee agreed to table this item.

7. Updates on Projects Programmed for FY 1999 and FY 2000

Paul Ward indicated that getting projects approved for construction or design is becoming problematic at ADOT. Environmental clearance will take approx 6 months. There are means of

getting around that such as getting the environmental work done and getting ADOT to review and approve them. Brian Latte asked about the possibility of getting the environmental requirements waived. Paul Ward indicated that ADOT may consider them on a case by case. The ADOT local government section should be contacted for more information on that topic. Mr. Ward went on to state that he is working on an official letter from MAG to ADOT on what projects MAG expects to obligate this year and the next year. Acceleration of the freeway program is also likely to result in ADOT staff being overloaded. Mr. Ward stated that the easiest way to get around this problem is to find a consultant that can do the work to ADOT's satisfaction, getting that work done and submit it to ADOT for review and approval. Ed VanDerGinst, citing the Tempe experience, pointed out that even when that is done the review process at ADOT causes unnecessary delays.

A question was asked on when a project is considered obligated. The following is a summary of Paul Ward's answer:

A project is considered obligated when the 1240 form is issued by FHWA. Environmental clearances must be obtained before the project can be obligated by September 15<sup>th</sup> of a given fiscal year. If the project is ready to bid it is ready to obligate. A project can also be ready to obligate prior to being ready to bid. ADOT can determine that in their estimation that the project is ready to bid, if it can do that by end of calendar year.

The clearances required from ADOT are: environmental clearance; utility clearances; right-of-way clearance. In addition plans, specifications and estimate must be ready. When these documents are ready an Intergovernmental Agreement must be drawn by the agency and ADOT. Even if a city is qualified to self certify, all these steps need to be followed and approved by ADOT.

For design projects the requirements are less. At least initial environmental clearance must be approved. You also must have your procurement process approved by ADOT. The individual project must be called out in the TIP/STIP with the MAG 5 year program.

Paul Ward distributed a hand out from ADOT on steps to be followed when selecting a consultant for preliminary engineering design of federally funded projects. He stressed that member agencies that have projects for FY 2000 need to start the process now.

PSB Murthy is the local government contact at ADOT for any questions

#### 8. Status Reports by Committee Members of ITS Activities

Ed VanDerGinst indicated that this would be his last ITS committee meeting as he is retiring from service. Chairman Hogan thanked Ed for his diligent participation in the committee and wished him luck.

Pierre Pretorius mentioned that the county is looking at a project that involves AVL in county vehicles for security. He asked if any cities were interested in the project. Primary applications of the technology was for fleet management applications. The system that the county is looking at does

not need driver input. Stating that city vehicle fleet managers may be interested in that, Steve Hogan suggested that members take that back to the agencies. He also asked Pierre Pretorius to send an email to the cities on that.

9. Next Meeting Date

The next meeting date was confirmed as 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, April 14, 1999.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.